REMARKS

After entry of this Amendment, claims 1-12 are pending in the Application. With this amendment, claims 1 and 5 are amended and claims 7-12 are added. Reconsideration of the Application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the non-final Office Action dated July 20, 2007, the Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph; claims 5-6 under 35 USC 102(b); and claims 1-6 under 35 USC 103(a).

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite because it is unclear if the ink referred to in line 9 simply *can* be dried using UV or *is* dried using UV, and if the filler referred to in line 10 is simply *capable* of imparting non-slip properties or *does* impart them. While the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the claim, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a composition including an UV-dried ink and has clarified that granular fillers impart non-slip properties to the surface of the ruler in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention. Thus, the Applicant has positively recited all elements in claim 1. After entry of this Amendment, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection.

Next, the Examiner rejects claims 5-6 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the Admitted Prior Art (APA). In response, the Applicant submits that rulers made by known processes do not feature non-slip surfaces with a composition of ultra-violet dried ink, an adhesive and a granular filling printed on the same surface of the ruler as the pattern of scalar markings. To more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention, the Applicant has amended claim 5 to make clear that the ruler as claimed includes a composition defining such a non-slip surface. The non-slip surface features structurally distinguish the rulers of claims 5 and 6 from rulers made by the APA processes. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's 35 USC 102(b) rejection. Additionally, the Applicant notes that the APA does not teach "applying screen printed abrasion resistant inks as patterns onto clear plastic surfaces which impart abrasion

resistance." (Paragraph 5 of Office Action dated July 20, 2007.) Instead, the Applicant stated that known processes result in a non-slip surface that wears away and degrades so that the filler is worn away or scratched off.

The Examiner also rejects claims 1-6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer (WO 97/09179) in view of the APA and Gust (US 2002/0110647). The Examiner states that Schafer discloses printing gradations on a transparent material, and that UV curable clear coatings including filler materials disclosed in Gust et al. could be used because the need for non-slip surfaces on quilting rulers is known in the APA. The Applicant submits that the Examiner has improperly considered Gust et al. because Gust et al. is not analogous art. The appropriate scope of prior art is related to rulers made of transparent material with scalar patterns and non-slip surfaces used for measuring fabric, as recited in the preamble of claims 1 and 7. Gust et al., on the other hand, is directed to a method of manufacturing polymer films that requires stretching the film, applying a UV coating, and then stretching the film again. Gust et al. does not involve rulers. If rulers were stretched after printing, as implied by the current rejection proposed by the Examiner, the gradient scales would be non-uniform and therefore useless for the intended purpose. The polymer films that are produced by the process in Gust et al. are thin enough to be used as laminating films; such thin films would not be suitable bases on which to form quilting rulers. Further, the thrust of Gust et al. is that an UV coating can be successfully applied to a polymer film after stretching the film in a machine direction and prior to stretching it in the transverse direction. The timing of the UV coating in Gust et al. is what allows the film to be UV cured without taking the material off-line. The Examiner cannot ignore the stretching steps immediately before and after the UV coating in Gust et al. because the stretching is interdependent with the UV coating. However, the quilting ruler base in the present invention cannot undergo the process disclosed in Gust et al. The quilting ruler base has scalar markings that are applied prior to the non-slip surface. The scalar markings would become distorted and useless if the quilting ruler base were stretched as required by Gust et al. Therefore, Gust et al. cannot be combined with Shafer to render

claims 1-6 obvious. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection.

Finally, Applicants have added new claims 7-12. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7-12 are allowable because none of the cited references teach or suggest a non-slip pattern including a composition of an ultraviolet-dried ink, an adhesive and a granular filler printed onto the same surface of the ruler as the scalar markings pattern.

It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment traverses and overcomes all of the Examiner's objections and rejections to the application as originally filed. It is further submitted that this Amendment has antecedent basis in the application as originally filed, including the specification, claims and drawings, and that this Amendment does not add any new subject matter to the application. Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment places the application in suitable condition for allowance; notice of which is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & BASILE, P.C.

Thomas Helmholdt
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33181
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107

Dated: November 13, 2007
TDH/ehm